

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1 and 6 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-10 are now pending in this application.

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because the abstract was too long. Applicant is submitting a new Abstract to replace the previously submitted Abstract. The objection to the abstract should now be withdrawn.

Claim 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,182,142 to Win et al. (hereinafter "Win"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims for at least the following reasons.

The present invention relates to methods and systems for provisioning users with resources. According to an embodiment of a method, the provisioning includes determining which resource provisioning policies are applicable to a particular user based on received user role information, organizational information, and attribute information. The method includes "seeking additional information or authorizations from third parties in accordance with the applicable resource provisioning policies." The additional information or authorizations are then used to, at least in part, determine the provisioning of the resources to the user. For example, as described in the specification, additional information may be sought from a department manager for cubicle or office location for a new employee. See Spec., page 33, lines 7-17. Also, for

example, an authorization from a vice-president may be sought to provision an employee with a more expensive phone than the resource provisioning policies allow. See Spec. page 32, lines 24-28. Thus, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6, “the provisioning of the resources [is] determined at least in part by the additional information or authorizations.”

By contrast, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Specifically, Win discloses a method of controlling access to information resources. The disclosed system of Win allows administrators to implement access rules by defining roles for users. Once a role is assigned to a user, the provisioning of the resources is determined based solely on the access rules. Win fails to teach or suggest “seeking additional information or authorization from third parties” and “provisioning being determined at least in part by the additional information or authorizations.”

The Office Action cites Win as disclosing “seeking additional information or authorizations from third parties” at col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 5 and col. 7, lines 41-49. However, the cited passages relate only to verification of the user’s resource authorization. Specifically, Win states that a module “decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is authorized to access the resource. The information in the cookie does not determine what resources are provisioned, but rather merely verifies the determination already made based on the access rules.

Since Win fails to teach or suggest at least that feature of independent claims 1 and 6, claims 1 and 6 are patentable. Claims 2-5 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1, and claims 7-10 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 6. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

October 7, 2004

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 23392

Telephone: (310) 975-7963

Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

By

Saige Dhand Reg # 51,182

for Ted R. Rittmaster
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,933